

## REMARKS

Claims 1-77 are pending in the present application. Claims 12, 15, 16 and 18-77 stand rejected and Claims 13, 14 and 17 have been objected to. Claims 22-77 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 12, 13, 17, 18, 19 and 20 have been amended herein, and Claims 78-86 have been newly added herein. Newly added dependent Claims 78-66 all fall within the elected Group and are supported by the originally filed application. Reconsideration of the instant rejections is respectfully requested. The amendment and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action.

Objected to dependent Claim 17 has been essentially added to base independent Claim 12 and the elements of base independent Claim 12 have been essentially added to objected to dependent Claim 13.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 12, 15 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over this cited reference. The Examiner's inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,878,734 to Zeldman. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's

inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 22-30, 33, 34, 43, 44, 56, 57 and 59-61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,305 to Cotterill et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 31, 32, 35-42 and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,752,305 to Cotterill et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,901,431 to Gast. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,901,431 to Gast. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's

inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 49 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,901,431 to Gast, and U.S. Patent No. 5,752,305 to Cotterill et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,752,305 to Cotteril et al. and the Affidavit of John Vrana (Vrana). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,752,305 to Cotteril et al., IBEC (Body Assembly & Manufacturing, September 1994) and U.S. Patent No. 4,901,431 to Gast. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is

believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 63 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,752,305 to Cotteril et al. and Vrana. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected Claims 64-70 and 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,829,115 to Speller, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,752,305 to Cotterill et al., Vrana and IBEC. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. The Examiner's inherency and/or obviousness argument is incorrect and unsupported. Notwithstanding, the present amendment renders this rejection as moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the instant amendments, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner pass the case to issue at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 24, 2008

By:   
Monte L. Falcoff, Reg. No. 37,617

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MLF/pml